



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/441,388	11/16/1999	MATTHEW ACKLEY	2043.162US1	4261
49845	7590	07/20/2011	EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/EBAY P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			ROSWELL, MICHAEL	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	2171			
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
07/20/2011	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO@SLWIP.COM
request@slwip.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/441,388	Applicant(s) ACKLEY ET AL.
	Examiner MICHAEL ROSWELL	Art Unit 2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 May 2011.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 27-29,31-35,38-40,42-45 and 49-72 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 27-29,31-35,38-40,42-45 and 49-72 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20110517, 20110606
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to the Request for Continued Examination filed 17 May 2011.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 27-29, 31-35, 38-45, 49-65, and 69-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,119,152 (Carlin et al), "Domain Names - Concepts and Facilities" (RFC 1034), and Fisher et al (US Patent 5,835,896), hereinafter Fisher.

Regarding claim 27, Carlin discloses in col. 2, lines 10-38 a multi-provider (i.e. plurality of sales interfaces) online sales system, wherein a plurality of service providers are each allocated a subset of subscriber features and a customized user interface. Figures 3a-3j illustrate the user interface provided by the multi-provider online sales system, which allows each service provider to build a customized sales interface by receiving user inputs for an arrangement of a plurality of user interface elements, the plurality of user interface elements defining display attributes for at least one of the plurality of sales interfaces, at col. 6, line 37 through col. 7, line 13. In col. 5, lines 16-42, Carlin further discloses that each subscriber of a service provider sees the associated online service as independent even though the server providing the interface is maintained by the multi-provider online sales system. In col. 1, lines 19-27, Carlin explains that online services can operate over a TCP/IP network. This embodiment would further require that each sales interface and the host computer be located at

a unique network address. Carlin further teaches that the sales server is operative to create the impression to a first user that the first user is still using a first member site through which the first user accessed a first sales interface and to create the impression to a first user that the first user is still using a second member site through which the second user accessed a second sales interface, as the menu system in Carlin remains consistent with the sales interface found in Figs. 3a-3j. Carlin fails to specifically disclose, though, that the first domain is a sub-domain of an address mapped to the first member site and that the second domain is a sub-domain of an address mapped to the second member site. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to map each interface to a different subdomain because of Carlin's suggestion in col. 8, lines 54-56, which says that it should appear to the subscriber that he or she is connected to an online service that is administered by that service provider. One method for providing such an appearance is through the use of subdomains. RFC 1034, published by the Network Working Group in 1987, describes how the domain hierarchy works on page 8:

A domain is identified by a domain name, and consists of that part of the domain name space that is at or below the domain name which specifies the domain. A domain is a subdomain of another domain if it is contained within that domain. This relationship can be tested by seeing if the subdomain's name ends with the containing domain's name. For example, A.B.C.D is a subdomain of B.C.D, C.D, D, and " ".

Each service provider in Carlin's invention can thus be a subdomain of the domain operated by the multi-provider online sales system. If, for example, the primary domain was multi-provider.com, a plurality of service providers could be mapped to provider1.multi-provider.com, provider2.multi-provider.com, and so on. The service providers' interfaces can then be operated by a single sever while creating the impression that they are operated by unique domains. Subdomains, however, need not necessarily be operated by a single server. After all, yahoo.com and google.com are both subdomains of the .com domain, but are operated by different servers. Accordingly, each service provider can have its own subdomain that is

operated by a unique server. For example, site1.provider1.multi-provider.com and site2.provider1.multi-provider.com can be operated by a server that is separate from the one that operates provider1.multi-provider.com and provider2.multi-provider.com. Links can then be created from pages on one server (i.e. member sites) to pages on another server wherein both sets of pages are mapped to the same parent domain. The examiner thus submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a hierarchy of domains and subdomains as taught by RFC 1034 in combination with the teachings of Carlin so as to anticipate the claimed invention. As suggested by Carlin, such a combination would have been advantageous because it would allow the multi-provider online sales system to maintain the impression that each sales interface is operated by its respective service provider and not by a single common entity.

However, Carlin and RFC 1034 fail to explicitly teach the sales server to receive a bid for a listing of an item for sale in an auction that is presented to the first user via the first sales interface and receive a second bid for the listing of the item for sale in the auction that is further presented to the second user via the second sales interface.

Fisher teaches an electronic auction system similar to the sales system of Carlin and RFC 1034. Furthermore, Fisher teaches an auction system comprising a central database for storing and receiving listings of items for sale, bids on those items, and posting a "catalog page" containing data about the items, at col. 4, line 46 through col. 5, line 6. Fisher shows the listings being received from a sales server, similar to that of Carlin, through the automated uploading of merchandise information to the database, at col. 8, lines 42-53. See also Fisher, col. 7, lines 24-28 and col. 6, lines 13-29.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Carlin, RFC 1034, and Fisher before him at the time the invention was made to

modify the sales interface of Carlin and RFC 1034 to include the auction server of Fisher, in order to obtain the sales server to receive a bid for a listing of an item for sale in an auction that is presented to the first user via the first sales interface and receive a second bid for the listing of the item for sale in the auction that is further presented to the second user via the second sales interface. One would have been motivated to make such a combination for the advantage of implementing an automated, continuous auction. See Fisher, col. 4, lines 12-29.

Referring to claim 28, the teachings of RFC 1034 are all associated with Domain Name System (DNS) mappings such that the sales server further operates to generate a Domain Name System (DNS) mapping of subdomain names for the first and second sales interfaces, wherein at least a portion of each of the subdomain names is consistent with the unique network addresses of the corresponding first and second sales interfaces. The mapping of different sites is thus performed via DNS mapping.

Referring to claim 29, Carlin discloses in Table 1 a plurality of services that can be offered via the customized user interfaces, and are inherently presented on different pages linked by the menu structure illustrated in Figure 3j.

Referring to claims 31 and 32, Carlin and RFC 1034 fail to explicitly disclose that the first sales interface includes elements that are also included in the first set of pages and that the second sales interface includes elements that are also included in the second set of pages. However, the examiner submits that it is notoriously well known in the state of the art that pages mapped to the same domain commonly reuse graphical interface elements such as headers, banners, menus, links, and backgrounds so as to maintain a common look and feel when

navigating amongst pages. The examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of this teaching. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include common interface elements among the first and second sales interfaces and their respective sets of pages in order for the multi-provider online sales system to maintain the impression that each sales interface and its associated pages is operated by its respective service provider.

Referring to claim 33, Carlin and RFC 1034 fail to explicitly disclose that sales interfaces include interface elements comprising at least part of their respective domain names. However, the examiner submits that it is notoriously well known in the state of the art that parts of the domain names are typically indicative of the respective service provider's name (e.g. Amazon.com), and are thus very commonly included in sales interfaces. The examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of this teaching. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include part of the domain name in a user interface as a mechanism for associating the domain name with the name of the service provider. Such an association makes it easier for users to re a network address and navigate to a service provider's sales interface.

Referring to claim 34, Carlin teaches a customizable user interface for the plurality of sales interfaces including receiving a user arrangement of a plurality of user interface tokens, the user interface tokens defining display attributes of at least one view of at least one of the plurality of sales interfaces, wherein the user interface tokens represent parts of the sales interface that are moveable or customizable (at col. 6, line 37 through col. 7, line 13, and seen in Figs. 3a-3j).

Referring to claim 35, as discussed above, Carlin and RFC 1034 disclose a host server and a plurality of sales interfaces that provide the impression that they are being operated by different entities. In Figures 3a-3j, Carlin illustrates a customization interface responsive to user input to define the sales interfaces. As mentioned above, Carlin explains in col. 8, lines 54-56, that from the subscriber's standpoint, it should appear that he/she is connected to an online service which is administered by that service provider. Additionally, Carlin explains in col. 4, lines 37-51 that service providers can upload data for access solely to its own subscribers. Therefore, it is implied that the customization interface is operative to provide different headers for each sales interface. Carlin further teaches that the sales server is operative to create the impression to a first user that the first user is still using a first member site through which the first user accessed a first sales interface and to create the impression to a first user that the first user is still using a second member site through which the second user accessed a second sales interface, as the menu system in Carlin remains consistent with the sales interface found in Figs. 3a-3j. Carlin fails to specifically disclose, though, that the first domain is a sub-domain of an address mapped to the first member site and that the second domain is a sub-domain of an address mapped to the second member site. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to map each interface to a different subdomain because of Carlin's suggestion in col. 8, lines 54-56, which says that it should appear to the subscriber that he or she is connected to an online service that is administered by that service provider. One method for providing such an appearance is through the use of subdomains. RFC 1034, published by the Network Working Group in 1987, describes how the domain hierarchy works on page 8:

A domain is identified by a domain name, and consists of that part of the domain name space that is at or below the domain name which specifies the domain. A domain is a subdomain of another domain if it is contained within that domain. This relationship can be

tested by seeing if the subdomain's name ends with the containing domain's name. For example, A.B.C.D is a subdomain of B.C.D, C.D, D, and " ".

Each service provider in Carlin's invention can thus be a subdomain of the domain operated by the multi-provider online sales system. If, for example, the primary domain was multi-provider.com, a plurality of service providers could be mapped to provider1.multi-provider.com, provider2.multi-provider.com, and so on. The service providers' interfaces can then be operated by a single sever while creating the impression that they are operated by unique domains. Subdomains, however, need not necessarily be operated by a single server. After all, yahoo.com and google.com are both subdomains of the .com domain, but are operated by different servers. Accordingly, each service provider can have its own subdomain that is operated by a unique server. For example, site1.provider1.multi-provider.com and site2.provider1.multi-provider.com can be operated by a server that is separate from the one that operates provider1.multi-provider.com and provider2.multi-provider.com. Links can then be created from pages on one server (i.e. member sites) to pages on another server wherein both sets of pages are mapped to the same parent domain. The examiner thus submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a hierarchy of domains and subdomains as taught by RFC 1034 in combination with the teachings of Carlin so as to anticipate the claimed invention. As suggested by Carlin, such a combination would have been advantageous because it would allow the multi-provider online sales system to maintain the impression that each sales interface is operated by its respective service provider and not by a single common entity.

However, Carlin and RFC 1034 fail to explicitly teach the sales server to receive a bid for a listing of an item for sale in an auction that is presented to the first user via the first sales

interface and receive a second bid for the listing of the item for sale in the auction that is further presented to the second user via the second sales interface.

Fisher teaches an electronic auction system similar to the sales system of Carlin and RFC 1034. Furthermore, Fisher teaches an auction system comprising a central database for storing and receiving listings of items for sale, bids on those items, and posting a "catalog page" containing data about the items, at col. 4, line 46 through col. 5, line 6. Fisher shows the listings being received from a sales server, similar to that of Carlin, through the automated uploading of merchandise information to the database, at col. 8, lines 42-53. See also Fisher, col. 7, lines 24-28 and col. 6, lines 13-29.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Carlin, RFC 1034, and Fisher before him at the time the invention was made to modify the sales interface of Carlin and RFC 1034 to include the auction server of Fisher, in order to obtain the sales server to receive a bid for a listing of an item for sale in an auction that is presented to the first user via the first sales interface and receive a second bid for the listing of the item for sale in the auction that is further presented to the second user via the second sales interface. One would have been motivated to make such a combination for the advantage of implementing an automated, continuous auction. See Fisher, col. 4, lines 12-29.

Referring to claim 38, Carlin discloses in col. 2, lines 10-38 a multi-provider online sales system, wherein a plurality of service providers are each allocated a subset of subscriber features and a customized user interface. Figures 3a-3j illustrate the user interface provided by the multi-provider online sales system, which allows each service provider to build a customized sales interface. In col. 5, lines 16-42, Carlin further discloses that each subscriber of a service provider sees the associated online service as independent even though the server providing

the interface is maintained by the multi-provider online sales system. In col. 1, lines 19-27, Carlin explains that online services can operate over a TCP/IP network. This embodiment would further require that each sales interface and the host computer be located at a unique network address. Carlin further teaches that the sales server is operative to create the impression to a first user that the first user is still using a first member site through which the first user accessed a first sales interface and to create the impression to a first user that the first user is still using a second member site through which the second user accessed a second sales interface, as the menu system in Carlin remains consistent with the sales interface found in Figs. 3a-3j. Carlin fails to specifically disclose, though, that the sales interfaces operate at different domains. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to map each interface to a different domain because of Carlin's suggestion in col. 8, lines 54-56, which says that it should appear to the subscriber that he or she is connected to an online service that is administered by that service provider. One method for providing such an appearance is through the use of subdomains. RFC 1034, published by the Network Working Group in 1987, describes how the domain hierarchy works on page 8:

A domain is identified by a domain name, and consists of that part of the domain name space that is at or below the domain name which specifies the domain. A domain is a subdomain of another domain if it is contained within that domain. This relationship can be tested by seeing if the subdomain's name ends with the containing domain's name. For example, A.B.C.D is a subdomain of B.C.D, C.D, D, and " ".

Each service provider in Carlin's invention can thus be a subdomain of the domain operated by the multi-provider online sales system. If, for example, the primary domain was multi-provider.com, a plurality of service providers could be mapped to provider1.multi-provider.com, provider2.multi-provider.com, and so on. The service providers' interfaces can then be operated by a single sever while creating the impression that they are operated by unique domains. Subdomains, however, need not necessarily be operated by a single server. After all,

yahoo.com and google.com are both subdomains of the .com domain, but are operated by different servers. Accordingly, each service provider can have its own subdomain that is operated by a unique server. For example, site1.provider1.multi-provider.com and site2.provider1.multi-provider.com can be operated by a server that is separate from the one that operates provider1.multi-provider.com and provider2.multi-provider.com. Links can then be created from pages on one server to pages on another server wherein both sets of pages are mapped to the same parent domain. The examiner thus submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a hierarchy of domains and subdomains as taught by RFC 1034 in combination with the teachings of Carlin so as to anticipate the claimed invention. As suggested by Carlin, such a combination would have been advantageous because it would allow the multi-provider online sales system to maintain the impression that each sales interface is operated by its respective service provider and not by a single common entity.

However, Carlin and RFC 1034 fail to explicitly teach receiving a bid for a listing of an item for sale in an auction that is presented to the first user via the first sales interface and receiving a second bid for the listing of the item for sale in the auction that is further presented to the second user via the second sales interface.

Fisher teaches an electronic auction system similar to the sales system of Carlin and RFC 1034. Furthermore, Fisher teaches an auction system comprising a central database for storing and receiving listings of items for sale, bids on those items, and posting a "catalog page" containing data about the items, at col. 4, line 46 through col. 5, line 6. Fisher shows the listings being received from a sales server, similar to that of Carlin, through the automated uploading of merchandise information to the database, at col. 8, lines 42-53. See also Fisher, col. 7, lines 24-28 and col. 6, lines 13-29.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Carlin, RFC 1034, and Fisher before him at the time the invention was made to modify the sales interface of Carlin and RFC 1034 to include the auction server of Fisher, in order to obtain the sales server to receive a bid for a listing of an item for sale in an auction that is presented to the first user via the first sales interface and receive a second bid for the listing of the item for sale in the auction that is further presented to the second user via the second sales interface. One would have been motivated to make such a combination for the advantage of implementing an automated, continuous auction. See Fisher, col. 4, lines 12-29.

Referring to claim 39, the teachings of RFC 1034 are all associated with the Domain Name System (DNS). The mapping of different sites is thus performed via DNS mapping.

Referring to claim 40, Carlin discloses in Table 1 a plurality of services that can be offered via the customized user interfaces, and are inherently presented on different pages linked by the menu structure illustrated in Figure 3j.

Referring to claims 42 and 43, Carlin and RFC 1034 fail to explicitly disclose that the first sales interface includes elements that are also included in the first set of pages and that the second sales interface includes elements that are also included in the second set of pages. However, the examiner submits that it is notoriously well known in the state of the art that pages mapped to the same domain commonly reuse graphical interface elements such as headers, banners, menus, links, and backgrounds so as to maintain a common look and feel when navigating amongst pages. The examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of this teaching. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to include common interface elements among the first and second sales interfaces and their respective sets of pages in order for the multi-provider online sales system to maintain the impression that each sales interface and its associated pages is operated by its respective service provider.

Referring to claim 44, Carlin and RFC 1034 fail to explicitly disclose that sales interfaces include interface elements comprising at least part of their respective domain names. However, the examiner submits that it is notoriously well known in the state of the art that parts of the domain names are typically indicative of the respective service provider's name (e.g. Amazon.com), and are thus very commonly included in sales interfaces. The examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of this teaching. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include part of the domain name in a user interface as a mechanism for associating the domain name with the name of the service provider. Such an association makes it easier for users to remember a network address and navigate to a service provider's sales interface.

Referring to claim 45, Carlin explains in col. 2, lines 10-20 that the invention is a multi-provider on line service allowing a plurality of service providers to uniquely configure the appearance of their respective user interfaces. Each of these service providers can inherently include dedicated administrators related to separate member organizations and different legal entities.

Regarding claim 49, Carlin explains in col. 2, lines 10-20 that the invention is a multi-provider on line service allowing a plurality of service providers to uniquely configure

the appearance of their respective user interfaces. Each of these service providers can inherently belong to different legal entities.

Regarding claim 50, the naming conventions of RFC 1034 teaches the first domain including a domain name for the first server that includes a subdomain name for the sales server that includes a subdomain name for the first user interface, and wherein the second domain includes a domain name for the second server that includes a subdomain name for the sales server that includes a domain name for the second user interface.

Regarding claim 51, the use of registration processes to make online interactions and transactions more secure are notoriously well known in the art, and would be obvious to include in any system incorporating sales or auctions. The examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of these teachings.

Regarding claim 52, Carlin and RFC 1034 teach access to a sales/auction server without the use of servers.

Regarding claim 53, Applicant's own specification admits that "Internet auction systems are well known" (page 1). As such, the sales server of Carlin is analogous to an auction server, and the examiner contends that as claim 27 states, "the first sales interface includes links to a first set of pages not operated by the sales server but being mapped to the first domain", the cited limitation inherently teaches the first set of pages being used to access the first sales interface. Fisher further teaches an auction system, as disclosed *supra*.

Regarding claim 54, Applicant's own specification admits that "Internet auction systems are well known" (page 1). As such, the sales interface of Carlin is analogous to an auction interface, and therefore receiving a bid from a user is inherent in the sales/auction interface of Carlin. Fisher further teaches an auction system, as disclosed *supra*.

Regarding claims 55 and 56, as the sales/auction servers have been disclosed in claim 27 to "operate the first and second sales interfaces", it is inherent that the auction server generates the first sales interface, and that the interface resemble the first set of pages, disclosed to be linked to the first interface.

Regarding claim 57, Fisher teaches the sales system being an auction system, and the items for sale are auction items, and the first and second sales interfaces are auction interfaces (taught as the auction system, biddable items, and description pages of col. 4, line 46 through col. 5, line 6).

Regarding claim 58, Fisher teaches each auction interface corresponding to an auction site (the merchandise catalog pages), and wherein the central database system is adapted to store action items available on the auction sites (taught as the merchandise database, seen at col. 4, line 46 through col. 5, line 6).

Regarding claim 59, Fisher teaches the sales server being an auction server, and the auction server being further adapted to receive bids from the auctions sites (taught as the ability to receive bids through the merchandise pages, as seen in Fig. 2 and at col. 4, line 46 through col. 5, line 6).

Regarding claim 60, Fisher teaches the auction server being further adapted to store the received bids in the central database system (taught as the storing of bid information in a bid database, at col. 4, lines 46-60).

Regarding claim 61, Fisher teaches the auction server being further adapted to index the received bids (taught as the use of a bid manager for sorting and marking received bids, at col. 9, lines 1-16).

Regarding claim 62, Fisher teaches the received bids being stored as part of a series of item bidding histories in the central database system, as can be seen in Fig. 2, as bids are time stamped, stored, and subsequently displayed.

Regarding claim 63, Fisher teaches upon expiration of an auction period for an item, the auction server determines a highest bid and compares the bid to a reserve price wherein if the highest bid is above the reserve price the bid is successful (taught as the use of a "Buy or Bid" format where only bids greater than a predetermined price are deemed "successful", at col. 11, line 44 through col. 12, line 12).

Regarding claim 64, Fisher teaches the auction server being adapted to receive a listing file from a user and merge the listing file into the listings stored in the central database system as a series of listing items (taught as the ability of an operator to upload merchandise information into the database, at col. 8, lines 42-51).

Regarding claim 65, Fisher teaches the auction server comprising a publisher subsystem adapted to create at least a portion of the first or second sales interfaces prior to receiving a user request (taught as the creation of merchandise catalog pages by the automated auction manager, at col. 4, lines 46 through col. 5, line 6).

Regarding claim 69, Fisher teaches wherein a sales server provides an auction service (col. 7, line 66 through col. 8, line 14), in combination with the plurality of sales interfaces as taught by Carlin.

Regarding claim 70, Fisher teaches wherein the sales server generates a web page for each of the plurality of sales interfaces (see col. 6, lines 13-30, in combination with the plurality of sales interfaces in Carlin).

Regarding claim 71, Carlin teaches receiving a third plurality of customization commands from the first accountholder; receiving a fourth plurality of customization commands from the second accountholder; presenting, by the sales server, a third networked sales interface accessed through the first member site by the first user, the third networked sales interface being generated by the sales server based on the third plurality of customization commands received from the first accountholder; and presenting, by the sales server, a fourth networked sales interface accessed through the second member site by the second user, the fourth networked sales interface being generated by the sales server based on the fourth plurality of customization commands received from the first accountholder (taught as the customization of a user interface at col. 6, line 37 through col. 7, line 13, and seen in Figs. 3a-3j).

Regarding claim 72, Fisher teaches receiving a second listing of an item for sale in an auction that is presented to the first user via the first networked sales interface and receiving a third listing of an item for sale in the auction that is further presented to the second user via the second sales interface (see col. 4, line 46 through col. 5, line 6).

Claims 66-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carlin, RFC 1034, Fisher, and Sadiq et al (US Patent 6,032,153), hereinafter Sadiq.

Regarding claim 66, Carlin, RFC 1034 and Fisher teach a system similar to that of claim 65. However, Carlin, RFC 1034 and Fisher fail to explicitly teach the publisher subsystem storing an object model representation of the central database system, wherein the representation is for accessing data in the central database system in generating the first or second sales interfaces, and wherein the representation is modified on retrieval of changed records from the central database system.

Sadiq teaches a system for maintaining database persistence in a "shared object system", similar to that of Carlin, RFC 1034 and Fisher. Furthermore, Sadiq teaches storing an object model representation of the central database system, wherein the representation is for accessing data in the central database system in generating the first or second sales interfaces, and wherein the representation is modified on retrieval of changed records from the central database system (taught as the database persistence method of col. 3, line 46 through col. 4, line 44, in which a persistence service monitors and maintains state changes of database attributes, similar to the databases of Carlin, RFC 1034 and Fisher).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Carlin, RFC 1034, Fisher, and Sadiq before him at the time the invention was made to modify the auction system of Carlin, RFC 1034 and Fisher to include the database management of Sadiq. One would have been motivated to make such a combination for the advantage of efficiently updating a shared data source. See Sadiq, col. 2, lines 13-28.

Regarding claim 67, Sadiq teaches the publisher subsystem maintaining a dirty bit to indicate a change since the last generation of the first or second sales interface, as can be seen at col. 4, lines 51-65.

Regarding claim 68, Sadiq teaches the publisher subsystem scanning the central database system to find changed records, and applying rules to determine which changed records incur modifications to the representation, again taught as the use of the persistence service to monitor stored attributes and provide an indication of such change, at col. 4, lines 51-65.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 17 May 2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the Carlin reference "teaches a system that isolates the features of one service provider from the subscribers of another", and as such one group "will not have access to other features offered by the host computer which are not chosen by the service provider or to information provided by other service providers." Applicant considers a teaching in Carlin related to "databases that are private to a first service provider and can be made

accessible to a second service provider for inclusion in the second service provider's subset of features (col. 2, lines 39-45). Applicant, however, finds this insufficient to teach the claimed limitations "for the reason that Carlin further states that the first provider's database may only be utilized by a feature that is offered by the first service provider or the second service provider." However, the examiner has been unable to locate any such recitation in Carlin, and Applicant has failed to provide a relevant citation. Furthermore, Carlin at col. 6, lines 16-22 discloses:

The third class of features includes published features 32c. These are features uploaded from another provider who has designated these features as "published". A published feature may be accessed by any provider to include in its definition of features. The "publisher" of the features dictates the fee for access of the published service by subscribers of other providers.

Thus, Carlin teaches the ability for service providers to allow use of their "features" to any further service provider willing to pay a fee. Features as defined in Carlin include "electronic mail, forums, newsletters, on-line shopping, or searchable database of the second service" (col. 5, lines 4-6). Therefore, as Carlin teaches the ability to publish features for use across a plurality of service providers, the examiner maintains Carlin does not teach "a system that isolates the features of one service provider from the subscribers of another", as argued.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL ROSWELL whose telephone number is (571)272-4055. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 - 6:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chat Do can be reached on (571) 272-3721. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael Roswell /MICHAEL ROSWELL/
Primary Examiner
GAU 2171
7/15/2011